REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 16, 2008. Claims 1 to 11 and 13 to 15 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 10, 14 and 15 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 3, 5 to 9 and 13 to 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Published Appln. No. 2004/0201613 (Simpson) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,978,445 (Laane). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Simpson in view of Laane, and in further view of U.S. Published Appln. No. 2002/0046238 (Estavillo). Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Simpson in view of Laane, and in further view of U.S. Published Appln. No. 2002/0143814 (Hepworth). Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Simpson in view of Laane, in further view of Hepworth, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,047,033 (Wyler). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

The present invention relates to creating a printable representation while substantially maintaining the layout of the Web page as presented to the user upon the display screen. In on aspect of the invention, the scale of individual frames and their height are dynamically adjusted so that the width of the print media is not exceeded. The dynamic adjustment is determined by determining for each frame a record of corresponding frame dependencies and then operating upon each frame to create a corresponding display region into which appropriate content of the corresponding frame is placed. Accordingly, the dynamic adjustment of the scale of individual frames is achieved.

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 1 is directed to a method of forming a printable representation of a document having framed content. The method include the steps of (a) recording the position, height and width of each frame of said document in a display widow in which said document is presented; (b) identifying dimensions of a printing medium associated with said printable representation; (c) determining a height of content of each said frame; (d) determining, for each said frame, a record of any corresponding dependency frames, each said dependency frame being above said frame in said display window; (e) interpreting the records to establish a display order of said frames; (f) for each said frame, and in said display order: (fa) checking a start position of said frame against an end position of a created display region of a frame upon which said frame is dependent, and setting said start position to be said end position; (fb) creating a display region upon a page in said printable representation at said start position according to said corresponding content height; (fc) placing the content of said frame into said display region; and (fd) where said display region exceeds a page limit in said printable representation, terminating the display region at the page limit and creating a further display region upon a following page of the printable representation so as to span the content of said frame across the display region and the further display region.

Applicants submit that Simpson and Laane, whether taken alone in combination, fail to disclose all of the features of the present invention. Specifically, Simpson and Laane fail to disclose or suggest determining the properties of a displayed framed content, and processing the displayed framed content to create a suitable printable representation which, where said display region exceeds a page limit in said printable representation, terminates the display region at the page limit and creates a further display region upon a following page of the printable representation so as to span the content of said frame across the display region and the

- 10 -

further display region. The feature of spanning the content across the display region and the further display region allows preservation of the layout of the content when the document is printed.

In contrast to the present invention, Simpson is directed to creating compositions by arranging multiple documents on a single page. (See Simpson, paragraph [0006]). The issue of creating a printable representation of content while preserving the representation of the content on the display screen does not appear to be addressed at all in Simpson. In particular Figs. 4 to 9 of Simpson disclose that the user is merely given the ability to arrange documents within individual page arrangements. Accordingly, if the document does not fit within the space available in a certain page arrangement, the user can only add the document in question to a subsequent page arrangement instead. The user does not appear to have the ability to span a document across multiple page arrangements. In fact, it would appear that the user is simply presented with one page arrangement at a time, and therefore any user interface functionality to extend documents which exceed a single page arrangement to the next page arrangement is lacking. In this respect, we note that the system disclosed in Simpson may only be able to address the issue of web page frames exceeding a single page by allowing the user to manually rotate, scale and/or transform the document to make it fit within the arrangement. These manipulations are clearly distinct from the present invention, which preserves the on screen display of the content in the printable representation and therefore spans the content from a display region on one page of the printable representation to a further display region created on the next page.

In fact, Applicants submit that Simpson teaches away from the present invention in that the rearrangement or re-composition of a number of documents on a single page

will inherently produce a printed document which substantially differs from the original display of the documents on the screen. Simpson also emphasises the importance of providing the ability for the user to manipulate (by rotation, transformation and scaling) the imaging data for printing which would tend to further remove the arrangement from the content as displayed on the screen.

Applicants further note that the Office Action contends that Simpson discloses the feature of, where said display region exceeds a page limit in said printable representation, terminating the display region at the page limit and creating a further display region upon a following page of the printable representation. Specifically, the Office Action cites Simpson as disclosing that a document preview window can be used to arbitrarily arrange or otherwise manipulate imaging data. However, while the system disclosed in Simpson may provide some manipulation tools to the user, there is clearly no disclosure or suggestion of the detailed features of the present invention, such as determining whether a display region exceeds a page limit of the printable representation, wherein the display region is based on the determined height of the content.

The Office Action also makes reference to the resizing tools disclosed at paragraph [0051] in Simpson. However, Applicants note that this paragraph is exclusively concerned with arranging image data on a single page. As such, the issue of composing printable representations which span multiple pages does not appear to be addressed. Therefore, there is no disclosure or suggestion of processing the displayed framed content to create a suitable printable representation which, where said display region exceeds a page limit in said printable representation, terminates the display region at the page limit and creates a further display region upon a following page of the printable representation so as to span the content of said frame across the display region and the further display region, as featured in Claim 1.

Furthermore, in paragraph [0061] of Simpson, there is a disclosure of inserting additional pages. However, there is no mention of the circumstances in which additional pages are inserted. The decision to add additional pages is, as admitted in the Office Action, arbitrarily made by the user in this system. While the Office Action contends that the ability of the user to create a display region upon a following page would be obvious, there is no disclosure or suggestion of when additional display regions are inserted or how content is to be divided between such regions.

Applicants have reviewed Laane and submit that nothing in Laane is found to provide that which is missing from Simpson. Laane is concerned purely with the loading of a page and not with issues surrounding the printing of displayed pages to preserve a layout. As a consequence, it is not understood how a person of ordinary skill would utilize the disclosure of Laane, which is unconcerned with printing of documents, to deal with a printing issue. It is also noted that Laane is concerned with "data interdependency among frames 310, which may then require these frames to be loaded in some particular order when page 300 is loaded by the browser." (See Laane, column 5, lines 38 to 41).

In contrast to Laane, the present invention is concerned with the display and printing of frames, not with the order in which the frames are loaded to a browser for display. Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action confuses the issues of displaying framed content with printing frame content. The present invention is concerned with the accurate printing of framed content to replicate the manner in which the framed content is displayed and not with arranging frame content for display.

Furthermore, in Laane there is no disclosure or suggestion of checking a start position of the frame against an end position of a created display region of a frame upon which

- 13 -

the frame is dependent, and setting the start position to be the end position. However, in the Office Action, it is contended that such a feature is shown in Fig. 3 of Laane. However, what is shown in the figure is a display, which is merely the starting point and not the result of the operation of the apparatus of Claim 1.

In light of these deficiencies in Simpson and Laane, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully request same.

Claims 10, 14 and 15 are directed to a method, a computer-readable medium and a system, respectively, substantially in accordance with the apparatus of Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 10, 14 and 15 are also in condition for allowance and respectfully request same.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

<u>CONCLUSION</u>

No claim fees are believed due; however, should it be determined that additional claim fees are required, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 06-1205.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank Cire #42,419/
Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Applicants

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2882664v1